

Ian Maddison Harrisonburg, VA

The early days of the internet were a truly free market. Bandwidth was purchased by the user and profits from the transaction allowed the internet service providers (ISPs) to build or purchase optical fiber backbones larger than politicians' ambitious plans and faster than their dreams. Contracts remain similar where the user pays for a particular speed of data provision. There is no reason to assume that providers will make a loss when they have written the original agreement for data transmission.

I need to remind the FCC that when a user buys one end of a pipe, they should have a reasonable expectation that the other end of that pipe will have the same carrying capacity. Given the nature of a network, there exist numerous potential paths between a source of data and its consumer. This potential flexibility is enhanced by developments in virtual networks. Flexibility allows a telecoms firm to seek profit by reducing traffic or by charging individual data providers.

I wish to argue that net neutrality is essential. It allows an equal playing-field for all participants regardless of their size or political heft.

I have been running a Radiology web-site since Nov 1994. Since those heady days, a web presence is no longer thought benign. This is no reason to restrict the internet, but for the laws of the land on good behavior to apply through the courts when harm or potential-harm affects citizens. Again a free internet, unfettered by political interference, will allow trusted sources to reassert their influence. I would recommend the FCC establish an office for an internet ombudsman to be a source of independent information on honest sources of data and to be a recourse should ISPs exert too much power.

Finally I wish to restate my view that internet neutrality is essential to its function and to petition the FCC to keep the rules unchanged.